



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Sumerian and Akkadian Views of Beginnings.—By MORRIS JASTROW, JR., Professor in the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

I

Until a comparatively short time ago it was quite impossible to differentiate in the religions that developed thousands of years ago in the Euphrates Valley between elements that could be set down as Sumerian or non-Semitic and such as were Akkadian or Semitic. Even now it would be hazardous to dogmatize on the subject. Such attempts as were formerly made by some scholars, bolder than the rest, were entirely premature, as, for example, the view that the incantations and magical texts embodied Sumerian points of view, while hymns of a higher order and lamentation psalms were the contributions of Akkadians to the mixed Sumero-Akkadian culture. As a result, however, of the progress made during the past decade and the elucidation of the mysteries of Sumerian texts—a progress due chiefly to the researches of Thureau-Dangin, Delitzsch, and Poebel—we are in a far better position to interpret also the religious views revealed in these texts. The publication during recent years of many Sumerian religious texts of older periods, or late copies of unquestionably genuine and very old Sumerian originals, has added to the material now at our disposal for distinguishing Sumerian beliefs and points of view from such as are due to later accretions, reflecting Semitic thought and Semitic conceptions. To be sure, we must proceed cautiously in such attempted differentiation, both because of the uncertainty still prevailing in renderings of Sumerian texts and because of the mixed character of the Babylonian religion—composed of Sumerian and Semitic elements even in the earliest period to which our material carries us back.

Barring short votive inscriptions and the ordinary types of legal documents, which because of the occurrence of stereotyped formulas no longer offer any serious difficulties, the first translation of a Sumerian text is still necessarily tentative, and the cautious scholar intersperses his first rendering liberally with interrogation marks or asterisks as an indication of his doubt or his confession of ignorance. Our knowledge of Sumerian

is at present in the position in which Babylonian-Assyrian or, to use the more correct form, Akkadian, was some four decades ago—the general features pretty clearly ascertained, but with much uncertainty as to details. Until two decades ago, considerable doubt existed in the minds of many Assyriologists whether what was called Sumerian really represented a genuine language or was merely an ideographic method of writing Akkadian with all kinds of artificial semi-cryptic devices—a doubt justified by the vagaries of many Sumerologists and by the many strange phenomena presented by Sumerian that gave to it a surface appearance of artificiality. It is, therefore, no small achievement to find ourselves at present able to indicate many of the details of the verb formation, of the combinations of nouns with suffixes, and of the general features of the syntax. We are, furthermore, able in the case of long unilingual texts to furnish at least a general interpretation on which reliance can be placed. Moreover, after a tentative translation of a text has been given, it is possible through the combined efforts of scholars to reach out to more definite results in many matters of detail, albeit that the work of such decipherment is a slow and painful one—a step-by-step process with many pitfalls, to be avoided only by conscientious and unsparing self-criticism, together with a frequent revision of one's results.

With these precautions well in mind, let me put our present knowledge of Sumerian to a test by an endeavor to differentiate between Sumerian and Akkadian views of Beginnings on the basis of the material now at hand.

II

We may take as our starting-point the assumption, probable on *a priori* grounds, that when the Sumerians came to the Euphrates Valley as conquerors¹ they brought with them their traditions regarding the beginnings of things. Such traditions take their rise at an early stage of culture, and the Sumerians must have passed far beyond this stage before commingling with Akkadians. If, therefore, we find in the cuneiform literature

¹ I am leaving to one side the difficult question whether the Sumerians or the Akkadians were the first to settle in the Euphrates Valley, though my own inclination is to adopt Eduard Meyer's view (*Sumerier und Semiten in Babylonien*, p. 107 *seq.*) that the Semites were the first on the ground and that the Sumerians represent newcomers.

various views of such beginnings set forth, the attempt to explain such divergent conceptions through an apportionment among Sumerians and Akkadians respectively is at least justified, particularly when the variations point to divergent climatic conditions as their background.

A people dwelling in a valley and in a region where there is water in plenty, and where in fact the overflow of streams during a portion of the year becomes a menace to life and property, will develop different traditions of beginnings from those arising among a people whose home is in mountainous regions where water is less abundant and where there is no danger of inundations. What may be called the main version in cuneiform literature of the beginnings of things is the one familiar to us, since the discovery by George Smith² over forty years ago of a fragment in the library of Ashurbanapal, giving an account of a time when neither heaven nor earth 'had a name,' i. e. did not exist, and detailing the order in which at the beginning of time the gods were produced or evolved in pairs. This fragment proved to be the first tablet of a series of seven, dealing with the work of creation, in which the chief part was played by the god Marduk, who dispatched a monster Tiamat—the symbol and personification of the raging waters—after which the regular order of nature is established in place of the chaos and confusion prevailing while Tiamat and her army of monsters were in control. The circumstance that the hero of the myth is Marduk, the patron deity of the city of Babylon and the head of the pantheon after Babylon had become the capital of an empire, uniting the states or sections into which the Euphrates Valley had been divided, is sufficient evidence that this version of the Creation myth reflects the views and traditions of the Akkadians, who established the empire of which Babylon was the center. This conclusion is confirmed by a more detailed consideration of the contents of the portions of the seven tablets preserved.³ The entire series has been properly designated as a pæan in honor of Marduk, since his overthrow of Tiamat is the central deed. This overthrow forms the starting-point of creation, so

² See the first account of this discovery in TSBA. 2. 213-234, read at the meeting of December 3, 1872.

³ The standard edition is by L. W. King, *The Seven Tablets of Creation* (London, 1902, 2 vols.) in connection with *Cuneiform Texts*, etc., Part 13 (London, 1901).

far as a genuine conception of creation is involved. It might be more accurate perhaps to speak of a process of evolution, since it is not related that the universe is actually created, but merely that the regular order of the phenomena of nature is established after chaotic conditions had been overcome. The earth is assumed to be submerged beneath the waters that cover everything; it has 'no name,' because it was not visible, and therefore to all practical purposes did not exist. The earth meant is the verdure-covered soil, producing plants and trees, and swarming with life, just as by 'heavens' are meant the regular phenomena to be observed in the heavens. Tiamat and her brood represent the fury of the elements, rain and storms. The symbolism is unmistakable, for the name Tiamat means the 'sea' as the conglomeration of all waters. Tiamat and her brood, pictured as cruel and merciless and as destructive forces, symbolize the rainy and stormy season which in a region like the Euphrates Valley submerges large districts, produces havoc and chokes off manifestations of life on the earth till in the spring the sun triumphs over the rains and storms. The earth appears, and through the sun's rays vegetation is brought forth. The period of vegetation represents law and order established in the universe. Marduk is the sun-god, more particularly the youthful hero, identified with the sun of the springtime. The nature-myth underlying the story of Marduk's conquest of Tiamat is, therefore, the change of season from the winter or rainy season to the spring. We are not concerned here with earlier versions which may be discerned beneath the present one, or with the composite elements⁴ to be discerned in the seven tablets, but merely with its final form as clearly embodying the view of beginnings as it shaped itself during the period of Akkadian control in the Euphrates Valley, and received its final form as we have it. The main feature of the myth is that the world, conceived as law and order, began at the beginning of time in the spring. In accord with this we find the New Year's festival celebrated in Babylonia as in Assyria in the spring, and, therefore, the calendar, when perfected, beginning with the first spring month. Such a conception, with water as the primeval

⁴I have discussed these elements in a paper on 'The Composite Character of the Babylonian Creation Story' in the *Nöldeke Festschrift* (1906), 2. 969-982.

element that needs to be controlled before vegetation can arise, life endure, and sun, moon and planets move in their courses, is natural to a region marked by two large rivers emptying into a large body of water like the Persian Gulf. An astrological motif enters into the tale, assuming a close relationship between heaven and earth, and leading to a correspondence between events above to occurrences below, which is a feature of Babylonian-Assyrian 'theology.' The story in its present form belongs to the period when the seats of the gods, who as representatives of law and order are opposed by Tiamat and her army, have been transferred to the heavens.⁵ In accordance with this astrological setting, Marduk's first task after overcoming Tiamat is to pass across the heavens, assigning fixed positions to the stars—i. e. to the gods—and regulating the calendar through the phases of the moon. With the sun in control of the universe, the movements of the heavenly bodies are regulated, vegetation springs up below, and the earth is thus prepared to support life—animals and mankind. Heaven, accordingly, just as the earth, is assumed to be in existence, but the latter is not visible and the former does not manifest the regular phenomena of the heavenly bodies. The view here maintained is in keeping with the character of primitive creation tales or myths elsewhere, for the thought of a genuine creation out of nothing—a *creatio ex nihilo*—lies beyond the mental horizon of man in early and even in comparatively advanced stages of culture. As a trace of this limitation in the conception of beginnings, we find the keynote of the Akkadian creation-myth to be order rather than creation—order in place of the preceding lawlessness. The tale remains, despite the introduction of more advanced ideas, on a level with a genuine nature myth—picturing the world as beginning in the spring. It was suggested by the manner in which, because of the climatic conditions prevailing in the Euphrates Valley, there is repeated each spring on a small scale the process of the conquest of the waters, with new life in nature springing up as a consequence of the recession of the waters. The world begins in the spring after the winter rains and storms have ceased.

⁵ See Jastrow, *Aspects of Religious Belief and Practice in Babylonia and Assyria*, p. 207 seq., and *Religion Babyloniens und Assyriens*, 2. 420 seq.

III

Now by the side of this distinctively Akkadian version—there is no reason to assume that it reverts to a Sumerian original—we have another partially preserved version of creation, written in Sumerian, though fortunately accompanied by an Akkadian translation. While agreeing with the Marduk pæan in not passing back to any real period of a *creatio ex nihilo*, it unfolds in other respects an entirely different picture.

The text, imperfectly preserved,⁶ is an incantation to which as an introduction a narrative of the beginnings of things is attached.⁷ It betrays evidence of having been edited and modified in order to adapt it to later political conditions than those in existence at the time when the composition first arose. This is shown by the introduction of the city of Babylon and its temple as among the first cities to be established (line 14), whereas in an earlier section Nippur, Uruk, and Eridu are named, but not Babylon. Now, Babylon does not come into prominence till after the establishment of a Semitic dynasty

⁶ *Cuneiform Texts*, 13, pl. 35-38. See King, *Seven Tablets of Creation*, 1. 130-139.

⁷ This attachment of myths to incantations is characteristic of both Sumerian and Akkadian compositions. Thus, to give a few examples, we have a tale of a tooth-worm as the supposed cause of toothache introduced in connection with an incantation (*Cuneiform Texts*, 17, pl. 50)—the story forming, as it were, the justification for confidence in the incantation against toothache. The conflict between the moon and hostile powers, the story of the seven evil powers, etc., is part of an incantation series (*Cuneiform Texts* 16, pl. 13, col. iii; pl. 15, col. v, 28-58). An address to the 'River of Creation,' the remnant of some myth dealing with the beginnings of things, forms the introduction to two incantations (King, *Seven Tablets of Creation*, 1. 200-201). Langdon's recent publication of a Sumerian text, which will be discussed below (p. 290), likewise terminates in an incantation. In fact it would seem that to incantations we owe the preservation of most of our Babylonian-Assyrian myths. We encounter the same combination among other peoples. So, e. g., in ancient Germanic literary fragments as in the Merseburger charms, the introduction is a snatch of some myth to justify and strengthen the charm itself that follows. It is interesting to note that we also find bits of myths introduced into astrological texts. So, e. g., in Virolleaud, *L'Astrologie Chaldéenne*, Sin, no. i, and King, *Seven Tablets*, 2, pl. 49-50, the creation of the moon and sun by the triad, Anu, Enlil, and Ea. See Jastrow, *Religion Babyloniens und Assyriens*, 2. 544.

with Babylon as its center, the sixth member of which is Hammurapi (2123-2081 B. C.), who succeeds in uniting the Euphrates states into a great empire. The introduction of Babylon and its juxtaposition with such far older and genuine Sumerian centres as Nippur, Uruk, and Eridu belongs therefore to the post-Hammurapi age. There are other indications of considerable modification that this text has undergone, and by a careful analysis we can with some degree of certainty lop off the later additions from the original stock. To make this clear I will first give a translation of the text as it stands and then endeavor to restore the older form.

- 1 A holy house, a house of the gods (in) a
holy place⁸ had not been made.
Reed had not sprouted, tree had not been made.
Brick had not been laid, brick structure had not
been built.
No house made, no city built.
- 5 A city had not been made, living creature⁹ not
yet installed.
Nippur was not made, E-Kur not built.¹⁰
Uruk not made, E-Anna not built.
The Deep¹¹ had not been made, Eridu not built.
A holy house, a house of the gods—as its
dwelling was not made.¹²

⁸ The Sumerian original has merely 'the holy place' which is better, for the 'holy house' is the 'holy place.' The line aims to describe a time before the gods had any dwelling-place, i. e. therefore, before they existed.

⁹ A-Dam = *nam-maš-šu-u* with the verb *ša-kin* ('place') to convey the idea of filling a place with life. We might render it 'life had not swarmed.'

¹⁰ The city and its temples are inseparable, because the city is primarily the dwelling of the god of the place.

¹¹ Zu-Ab = *ap-su-u*.

¹² Ki-Ku-bi Nu Dim = *šu-bat-su ul ip-ši-it*, literally 'its dwelling was not built,' where *ip-ši-it* is the third person feminine of the Permansive of *epēšu*. The line is again intended, like line 1, to convey the thought that the gods were not yet. It is hardly likely that in the original Sumerian text the heaven as the dwelling-place of the gods was meant, though the later Akkadian translator may have had this in mind.

- 25 Verdure, the marsh plant, reed, and sprout
 he created.
 The green of the field he created.
 Lands, marsh,²⁰ and swamp,
 Cow with her young, mother-sheep with her lambkin,
 lamb of the fold,
 Groves and forests,
- 30 He-goat, mountain goat he placed.
 The lord Marduk at the edge of the sea an
 embankment shut off.
 reed, marsh (?) he placed.
 he brought forth.
 [Reed] he created, tree he created.
- 35 in the place he created.
 [Brick he laid], brick structure he built.
 [House he made], city he built.
 [City he made], living creature he installed.
 [Nippur he made], E-Kur he built.
- 40 [Uruk] he made, [E-Anna he built.²¹]

Line 5 taken in connection with line 12 points to Eridu lying at the Persian Gulf as the first 'city' to be established. The hero of this myth would, therefore, be the god of Eridu, known to the Sumerians as Enki and appearing in Akkadian texts as Ea. One of the most common designations of this deity is 'King of the Deep' and it is evident, therefore, that Lugal-Du-Azagga, 'King of the holy habitation', is a descriptive title of Enki,²² 'the holy habitation' being either Eridu or the temple at Eridu, or the Apsû or 'Deep' within which Enki dwells. The term was probably applied originally to the great body of water on which Eridu lay and was afterwards extended to both the city

²⁰ *Sug* = *apparu* occurring also in line 25 and, therefore, an indication of a second version of the creation of vegetation.

²¹ At this point there is a break in the tablet, and when (pl. 38) it becomes intelligible again, we are in the midst of an incantation. Perhaps two lines corresponding to lines 8 and 9 are to be added as follows:

'The Deep he made, Eridu he built.

A holy house, the house of the gods—as its dwelling he made.'

²² See further below (p. 298, note 63) on Du-Azagga as the Sumerian name of the 7th month (Tašritu) and perhaps originally the beginning of the year. Tašritu, the Akkadian equivalent, means 'beginning.'

and temple sacred to him. Since Eridu by virtue of its position must have been one of the oldest settlements in the region, if not indeed the oldest, it would be natural to find a 'creation' myth centering around this place as the first bit of *terra firma* to be created. A 'city,' which here simply means an inhabited place, is inconceivable from the Sumerian-Akkadian point of view without the temple as the 'house' of the god to whom the city is sacred. The 'holy house' is therefore in the first line, according to the Sumerian text,²³ equated with the 'holy place,' just as in line 4 'house' and 'city' are equated. The first four lines describe in a general fashion a time before anything that we associate with this earth of ours—temples, plants, trees, structures, and cities—existed. It is not, however, said, as in the Akkadian version, that neither heaven nor earth 'had a name.' Apparently the world exists, not even submerged—but it is empty.

With the repetition of the reference to the 'city' in line 5, we reach a more specific stage of the description of the beginnings of things and I venture to suggest that line 8,

The Deep had not been made, Eridu not built,

forms the parallel to line 5. Lines 6-7, mentioning two other old 'cities,' Nippur and Uruk, would then be later additions, introduced as illustrations of the time when nothing at all existed in this world. We may go a step further and take these two lines as belonging to another version which has been dovetailed into the one associated more particularly with Eridu. This view would carry with it the assumption that lines 9-11 belong to this 'Nippur' version, as we might call it, in contradistinction to the 'Eridu' version. An assumption of this nature would explain the repetition in line 9 of what has been already said, in line 1. Moreover the conception of 'all lands being sea' is in contradiction to line 8 where it is said that Apsû or the watery deep had not yet been made. The conception in the 'Nippur' version agrees with the one in the above discussed 'Akkadian' myth, according to which water covered everything at the beginning of time. Line 11 would also belong to the 'Nippur' version, beginning the description of the manner in which *terra firma* appeared or was brought into existence, the description being continued in line 18. The Eridu ver-

²³ See above, note 8.

sion, on the other hand, beginning with lines 1-5 and 8, continues in lines 12-13 with the description of Eridu and its temple as the first to be created. Line 14

Babylon he made, Esagila was completed,

is clearly a later insertion *ad maiorem gloriam* of the later capital of the Babylonian empire, the temple of which derived its name from the far older sanctuary of Eridu.²⁴ The use of an entirely different verb in this line—*Šu-dū* = *kalālu*, 'complete,' in place of *Dú* = *epêšu* or *Dim* = *banû*, 'make' and 'build'—points likewise to a different source for this line.

In the Eridu version the creator is naturally the god of Eridu, introduced as Lugal-Du-Azagga in line 13. It is he, therefore, who is to be regarded as the subject of lines 15 and 20, specifying the creation of the Anunnaki and mankind. Anunnaki is here a collective name used either for the gods in general or more probably for a group of deities under the tutelage of Lugal-Du-Azagga, constituting his court and who are created at one time by him. These Anunnaki assign a 'lofty name' for the holy city chosen by them, that is, for Eridu.²⁵ In order to provide a dwelling place, i. e. a temple in the city thus chosen, Lugal-Du-Azagga, it is said, (line 20) 'creates mankind.'²⁶

That humanity exists for the sake of the gods is the philosophy underlying this version. The gods wish to be worshiped; they need dwelling-places where the worshipers can gather. Men are therefore created to build temples as the essential feature of 'cities.'

Line 21 represents again a gloss to line 14, in part to conform to the later view which associates a female consort with every deity, in part to combine the version with another one which made the female divine element—here designated as

²⁴ The transfer is part of the general process, assigning to Marduk the attributes and distinction belonging to Ea of Eridu, who becomes the father of Marduk. See Jastrow, *Aspects of Religious Belief and Practice in Babylonia and Assyria*, p. 92, *seq.*

²⁵ The Sumerian form of the city is designated as *Dug*, 'the good city,' whereas in the Akkadian translation, it is likewise written ideographically but as *Nun-Ki*, 'the great' or 'royal' place.

²⁶ The conception is similar to what we find in the sixth tablet of the Akkadian version (King, *Seven Tablets of Creation*, 1. 86 *seq.*), where it is implied that mankind is created because the gods are lonely and want followers to pay them worship.

Aruru—the 'mother' of mankind. Aruru is merely one of many designations given to this element, which in the systematized pantheon of the Akkadians is symbolized under the generic designation of Ishtar.

There follows (lines 22-35) a description of the creation of animals and of plants and trees. The repetition points to a combination of two versions, since it is unlikely that in a unit text we would have double descriptions of (a) creation of animals (line 22 and again in line 28 and 30), (b) the springing up of verdure and plants (lines 25-27 and again lines 32-35), while (c) line 29 again impresses one as a gloss added to either the one or the other version. In fact it is possible that we have three versions of the creation of animals and plants dovetailed into one another, to be analyzed as follows: (a) lines 22-26, animals, Tigris and Euphrates, verdure and plants²⁷; (b) lines 27-28 and 30, verdure, plants, and animals (with line 29 as an interrupting gloss); and (c) lines 32-35, verdure, animals,²⁸ and trees. At all events, there can be little question that lines 22-26 belong to the Eridu version, as is indicated by the mention of the two great rivers which empty their waters into the great 'deep'—the domain of Lugal-Du-Azagga. It is this god, therefore, who creates the animals of the field, assigns courses to the two rivers, gives them their names (by which is meant his control of them, since he calls them into existence), and finally it is Lugal-Du-Azagga who causes vegetation to spring up. Lines 27-28 and 30 may belong to the Nippur version, while lines 31 and those following may represent a later addition in order to ascribe the honor of creation to Marduk.²⁹ If we are to assume a third independent version embodied in our text it would be the Marduk or Babylon version of which, therefore, line 14 would form a part.

This brings us to the last point to be considered in our analysis—the occurrence of the name Marduk in line 17 as the equiva-

²⁷ Line 26 would represent a general summary to indicate all kinds of vegetation.

²⁸ To be supplied in line 33, which would, therefore, read '[beasts of the field and living creatures of the field] he brought forth,' or similar words supplied at the beginning. Lines 31-32 would then form part of the 'Marduk' or 'Babylon' version together with lines 14 and 21.

²⁹ Or this, as an alternative, may form part of a second Nippur version, modified by the substitution of Marduk for Enlil. See below, p. 287.

lent of a Sumerian deity written Gi-Lim-ma. As the sole instance of such an equation, it is open to question whether the Akkadian translator is not revealing here his preference for Marduk rather than following a genuine tradition. If the line belongs to the 'Nippur' version, we should expect Gi-Lim-ma to be a designation of Enlil. The circumstance that in line 31, where the Sumerian portion is broken off, we have *be-lum Mar-duk*, 'lord Marduk,' points likewise to the substitution here of the god Marduk for the old patron deity of Nippur, who in the Akkadian myth of creation is obliged to yield his headship of the pantheon which he so long enjoyed to Marduk. The 'Nippur' version, consisting of lines 6-7, 9-11, 17, 18, 27-28, 30, and possibly also 33 and 35 (but hardly 31 and 32), would thus furnish us with an account of creation, beginning with a description of a chaotic condition when the waters prevailed everywhere, as in the Akkadian version, followed by an account of *terra firma* brought about by a foundation of some kind stretched on the waters on which a deity pours dust so as to secure soil. After this land and marsh appear in which animal life is placed and reeds and trees spring up. If line 21 belongs to this version,³⁰ we would also have a reference to the creation of mankind by a deity in association with a goddess.

The other version, forming, according to the thesis above set forth, the account of the beginnings of things, belonging to the old Sumerian center of Eridu, and consisting of lines 1-5, 8, 12, 13, 15, 16, 19, 20, 22-26, reads as follows:

- 1 A holy house, a house of the gods (in) a
holy place had not been made.
- 2 Reed had not sprouted, tree had not been made.
- 3 Brick had not been laid, brick structure had not
been built.
- 4 No house made, no city built.
- 5 A city had not been made, living creature not yet
installed.
- 8 The Deep had not been made, Eridu³¹ not built.
- 12 At that time Eridu was made, Esagila was built.
- 13 Esagila where in the midst of the Deep, Lugal-Du-
Azagga dwells.

³⁰ See, however, above, p. 284.

³¹ Written Dug-(ga), the 'good' city. See above, note 25.

- 15 The Anunnaki altogether he made.
- 16 A holy city, the dwelling of their choice, with
a lofty name they proclaimed.
- 19 That the gods might be brought to dwell in
their chosen dwelling,
- 20 Mankind he created.
- 22 Beasts of the field, living creatures in the field
he created.
- 23 The Tigris and Euphrates he made and put in
their place.
- 24 Their names in goodly fashion he proclaimed.
- 25 Verdure, the marsh plant, reed, and sprout he
created.
- 26 The green of the field he created.

This portion of our text I regard as the original stock which has been enlarged by the dovetailing into it of another version, probably originating in Nippur, which has been modified so as to make Marduk the hero; he replaces Enlil, the god of Nippur, who is described by one of his epithets as Gi-Lim-ma. Taking up now the 'Eridu' version, we note in the first place the absence of any conflict. There is no assumption of a chaotic condition at the beginning of time with the watery element in control. A city as the dwelling of the god Lugal-Du-Azagga and the production of the Anunnaki are the first steps in the work of creation, after which mankind and animals are created, and vegetation springs up. The version, therefore, assumes the earth to be in existence but empty. There is no life in it. The god of Eridu, Enki, described as 'king of the holy habitation,' is also in existence, and in a naïve way it is assumed that his dwelling place represents the starting-point of the world. There is implied here, as already suggested, a synonymy between the 'deep' as the dwelling of Enki and the 'city' of Enki which is Eridu. Both fall within the category of a 'holy place' (line 1) which the Akkadian translation, it will be recalled, modifies somewhat.³² The 'city' is also associated with the 'temple' in the 'city.' Both 'city' and 'temple' are copies of the 'Deep' as the prototype of Enki's dwelling, but the 'Deep' too must be created. This is significant by way of contrast to the Akka-

³² By adding 'in,' see above, note 8.

dian version which assumes the 'Deep' as the watery element in complete control and, therefore, of course, existing at the beginning of time. The underlying conception of the Eridu version is that the watery element must be created before the empty earth can be filled with human life and with animals, and before vegetation can be produced. Such a conception could hardly have arisen in the same climatic region as the one which gave rise to the 'Akkadian' version, emphasizing the superabundance of the watery element to such an extent as to assume the earth to be submerged beneath the surging mass, and necessitating a conflict to subdue the lawless element. The reflection of this view is also to be seen in the 'Nippur' version, dovetailed into the 'Eridu' version, and if we are to assume the existence of a third version in the text just analyzed, that too—a 'Babylon' or a second 'Nippur' version—would be in accord with the 'Akkadian' conception. The substratum of the text, on the other hand, points to an origin of the conception evolved in a region where water is not abundant, where instead of water being the element to be overcome it is the condition necessary to bring about all life and vegetation. The world begins according to this version with the coming of the watery element, not with its being placed under control. Creation was pictured as ensuing at the time of the beginning of the rainy season, not with the cessation of the rains and storms. The 'Eridu' version, therefore, directs us to some mountainous region where there are no streams that overflow and submerge entire districts, where water is not abundant, or at least not so abundant as to give rise to the view that it was the primeval element. If, therefore, the 'Akkadian' version represents the world as beginning in the spring, with the triumph of the sun over the rains and storms of winter, the 'Eridu' version would point to such a beginning in the fall of the year, when the winter rains set in. Now to be sure, Eridu is situated on the Persian Gulf, and therefore we would not expect any version to arise in that center which would represent the beginnings of things otherwise than in the 'Akkadian' story. We must, therefore, assume the 'Eridu' version to have been brought to this region by the Sumerians from their original homes. Where this home was, it is impossible at present to determine with any degree of certainty, but several indications point to its having been in a mountainous district. One

of these indications is the *zikkurat* or stage-tower, attached to temples of Babylonia in the old Sumerian centers. These stage-towers, consisting of a series of stories one above the other with either a winding ascent to the top or a direct ascent from one stage to the other, are clearly intended to represent a mountain and the circumstance that the seat of the deity to whom the tower is sacred was at the top points to a belief which placed the seats of the gods on the tops of mountains. Such a belief is common among peoples dwelling in a mountainous region, and the inference is justified that the people who introduced the *zikkurat*³³ into the Euphrates Valley came from such a region and by a natural impulse were led to reproduce a mountain in miniature to symbolize their old manner of worship. That the *zikkurat* is always attached to the temple proper, which is modeled after the pattern of a house with a court or two courts and with chambers around the courts, indicates that in this combination of two *motifs* in the religious architecture the 'house' comes first, and the *zikkurat*, as a supplement, second. The altar is in connection with the 'house,' and the main cult is carried on before the image of the god in the innermost part of the house, not on the top of the *zikkurat*.³⁴ We may, therefore, set down the temple or house *motif* as due to the Semites among whom, as among the Egyptians, the temple is patterned upon the dwelling-house, and the tower *motif* as the one introduced into the Euphrates Valley by the Sumerians. Again, the fact that the word for 'country' (*Kur*) in Sumerian means primarily 'mountain,' leads us likewise to a mountainous region as the home of the Sumerians. The sign reverts to the picture of a mountain. As against one word for both 'mountain' and 'country' in Sumerian, we have in Akkadian two separate words (*šadû*, 'mountain,' and *mātu*, 'country' or 'land'). The name E-Kur, 'mountain house,' as the designation of the temple of the Sumerian deity En-lil in Nippur, known to be one of the oldest of the Sumerian centers in the Euphrates Valley, may be instanced as a further proof, and in accord with this we find Enlil addressed

³³ The Sumerian term for *zikkurat* is *U-Nir*, to be explained perhaps as 'visible far and wide.'

³⁴ See for further details Jastrow, *Civilization of Babylonia and Assyria*, p. 374 seq.; and *Aspects of Religious Belief and Practice in Babylonia and Assyria*, p. 280 seq.

in hymns as the 'great mountain,'³⁵ and his consort Ninlil is also known as Nin-ḫar-sag, i. e. 'lady of the mountain.' Perhaps a name like E-sagila, 'high house', for Enki's temple at Eridu,³⁶ another exceedingly ancient, if not indeed the oldest, Sumerian settlement, is to be accounted for in the same way as E-Kur. Until some decisive evidence is forthcoming, the further question whether the Sumerians came from the mountainous districts of southern and central Asia Minor must be left in abeyance, with much in favor of Brünnow's view³⁷ that the Sumerians came to the Valley from the northwest rather than the northeast.

IV

We are fortunate in having another very ancient Sumerian text affording us a view of beginnings, and which upon analysis turns out to be in agreement with the above discussed 'Eridu' version, picturing the world at the beginning of time to be in existence, but empty through lack of water. With the coming of the rain, vegetation appears and the world is prepared to sustain life—animal and human. I refer to the text which Langdon has published under the title of *The Sumerian Epic of Paradise, the Flood and the Fall of Man* (Philadelphia, 1915). Langdon is entirely wrong in seeing in the beginning of the text a description of a primeval Paradise, as well as in his view that mankind was ejected from this fictitious Paradise with the coming of a flood from which a favored individual is said to have escaped, and that this favored individual, whom Langdon calls Tagtug, then forfeits the boon of immortality by eating of a forbidden fruit. I have tried to show this in a brief article on 'The Sumerian View of Beginnings' (JAOS 36. 122), which will be followed by a full analysis of Langdon's text in vol. 33 no. 2 of

³⁵ Rawlinson IV², pl. 27, no. 2, obv. 15-16; Gudea Cyl. A, col. viii, 16, etc. Meyer's view (*Sumerier und Semiten in Babylonien*, p. 33) that the seat of the gods on the tops of mountains is a Semitic conception is correct, but this does not exclude it also as a Sumerian belief.

³⁶ Then transferred to Marduk's temple at Babylon. See Jastrow, *Religion Babylonians and Assyrians*, I. 130 seq., and *Aspects of Religious Belief and Practice in Babylonia and Assyria*, p. 93.

³⁷ ZA. 28. 387. See Eduard Meyer's remarks in *Sumerier und Semiten in Babylonien*, p. 114, who leaves the question open. See further, Jastrow, *Civilization of Babylonia and Assyria*, p. 121, and King, *History of Sumer and Akkad*, p. 53 seq. and Appendix I.

the *American Journal of Semitic Languages*. Professor Sayce agrees with my view that there is no account of a flood in Langdon's text (*Expository Times*, November 1915), while Barton (*Archaeology and the Bible*, p. 283 note) as well as Prince (JAOS 36. 90) and finally Peters in a review of Langdon's publication, also agree with me in rejecting *all* of Langdon's theses. Langdon's rendering of the text or rather his two renderings³⁸ are full of false translations due to his faulty method and lack of attention to philological niceties, as his text is full of errors, some of which he has now himself recognized, though by no means all.³⁹ We are concerned here merely with the first two columns of the text.

The text opens with a description of the god Enki and his consort Nin-ella who dwell alone in a mountain, described as a 'holy place,' Ki Azagga,⁴⁰ corresponding to E Azagga, 'holy house' and Ki Azagga in the Eridu version of the beginnings of things above analyzed.

The name of the mountain is written with a sign the reading of which is doubtful. Langdon's proposal to identify it with Dilmun, written invariably Ni-Tuk, is good enough as a guess but on examination turns out to be indefensible.⁴¹ Let us call the place X for the present. Emphasis is laid upon the fact that Enki and his consort are 'alone' (lines 7 and 10). If, therefore, the 'holy place' in the mountain X is further described in a description comprising lines 13-21, as a spot where animals did not carry on their usual activities associated with them, it is reasonable to conclude that such a description is merely a poetic manner of emphasizing that no animals were found there. In other words Enki and Ninella are in a world in which there is not as yet any animal life. The raven, it is said in this description, did not croak, the kite (?) did not shriek, the lion

³⁸ What he calls a revised translation is given by him in the *Expository Times* for January, 1916, pp. 165-168, and we are now promised a third to be issued in French, which he announces will be the 'final' one.

³⁹ See his 'Critical Notes upon the Epic of Paradise,' JAOS 36. 140-145, the 'uncritical' character of which will be shown by me in my article in AJSL.

⁴⁰ The epithet occurs three times, lines 2, 4, 5, and is to be supplied in line 3 and probably also in line 1; it alternates with *El* 'pure' in lines 6, 9, and 12.

⁴¹ See the discussion of this reading in my article in AJSL.

did not slay, the wolf did not plunder the lambs, the dog did not tear the kids, and the unidentified animal (now read *zebu* by Langdon) did not graze, the young did not graze (?) with the mother, the bird of heaven did not do something, the dove did not hatch (?).⁴² To assume these lines to be a description of a primeval Paradise where all was 'peace and bliss,' as Langdon proposed, is clearly out of the question. If we had merely the lines about the lion, wolf, and dog, the interpretation would be possible, but a difficulty arises with the 'raven' and 'kite.' Why should ravens not croak or kites not shriek? That surely would not seriously disturb the bliss of Paradise, unless we assume that Enki and his consort were 'nervous,' sensitive to unpleasant noises. Line 18, where it is said that the *zebu* (?) did not 'graze,' is fatal to Langdon's thesis.⁴³ But human life is also non-existent in the 'holy place.' This is indicated in lines 22-25, again in poetic fashion, by saying that there were no diseases, that no one said 'mother' or 'father.' Since diseases were believed to be due to demons that had found their way into the body and which had to be exorcised in order that the sufferer might be relieved, the absence of disease was due to the fact that there were no demons, and this again because there were no people whom they could plague. 'Father' and 'Mother' was not said because there were no parents to be addressed and no children to address them.⁴⁴

The description in col. i of our text is, therefore, that of a world in existence but empty, and the reason for this absence of animal and human life is clearly indicated in line 26 where it is said:

In the pure place, no water flowed,
In the city no water was poured out.

Without water, life cannot exist, vegetation cannot spring up. The total absence of human activity is again indicated in the following lines in poetical fashion, after which the goddess Ninella—represented at once as the daughter and consort of Enki—appeals to the latter to supply the 'city' which he has

⁴² So Prince suggests (JAOS 36. 96). The verbs at the ends of the lines 19-21 are broken off or doubtful.

⁴³ See for a full discussion the article in AJSL.

⁴⁴ Parallel poetic phrases in Sumerian productions will be found in my article in AJSL.

founded with drinking water in abundance.⁴⁵ The 'city' is equated with the locality X in which Enki and Ninella dwell and the wish is expressed that the 'city' and 'place may drink water in abundance' and become the 'house of the gathering place of the land.' The 'city' as in the 'Eridu' version is conceived merely as a place to be inhabited. Wherever a god dwells there is a 'city,' of which the god is the patron, and where he is worshipped. The 'house' is the temple, as at once the home of the god and the sanctuary to which worshipers come to pay their homage. 'Land,' 'city,' and 'temple' are thus regarded as synonymous terms, as in the 'Eridu' version. The request of Ninella is granted, and in further sequence the coming of the waters is pictured as the result of a union between the god and the goddess, designated in this episode as Nintu 'the mother of the land,' her name signifying the 'lady of birth.'⁴⁶ The result is a rich vegetation, poetically described as⁴⁷

Like fat, like fat, like rich cream,
Nintu, the mother of the land, brought forth.

With the further episodes in this interesting text in which the drenching of the fields is twice again described we are not concerned, but merely with the view of Beginnings as set forth in the first two columns. This view has such points in common with the 'Eridu' version as to make it evident that the two belong to the same order and reflect the same climatic conditions. They must have originated in a region where water was not plentiful and where as a consequence vegetation and life are associated with the coming on of the rainy season. The world, therefore, is pictured as beginning in the fall when the rains set in, and

⁴⁵ Lines 31 to Col. ii, 10. The closing lines of Col. i are broken off. On this double relationship of Ninella (elsewhere designated as Damgalnunna (col. ii, 31) and Nintu (col. ii, 21), see my article in AJSL. The conception is met with elsewhere. If a male deity is pictured as the starting-point of the universe, the first goddess is produced by him and becomes his consort; she is, therefore, daughter and wife. If a female deity is the starting-point, she produces a son who becomes her husband. So, e. g., Ishtar and Tammuz.

⁴⁶ On the significance of this symbolism, the rain as the seed of the god poured into the womb of the goddess as 'Mother Earth,' see the article in AJSL, where parallels from other sources are adduced.

⁴⁷ Col. ii, 43-46.

not in the spring when the storms and rains cease. Such a condition is apt to prevail in mountainous districts where the streams are low or entirely dried up in the dry season and depend upon the rains to fill them again, in contrast to a mountainless plain like the Euphrates Valley, where the streams, fed from their sources, flow in abundance during the entire year and during the rainy season overflow and cause inundations.

Enki and his consort are described as dwelling in a mountain. Naturally, the old Sumerian tales of Beginnings were modified when the Sumerians left their mountain homes to come to the Euphrates Valley. Instead of the locality X in the mountains, the old cities in which the Sumerians established themselves, and more particularly Eridu at the head of the great body of water, became the scene of action. Enki, himself, whose name signifying 'The lord of the land' (or more vaguely 'place') becomes a water-deity and is identified with Ea whose home is the 'great deep,' i. e. the *Apsû*. A contrast is set up between the 'bitter waters' of the *Apsû*, and the sweet, drinkable waters of the streams; and in other ways the old myth is modified, indications of which are to be seen in Langdon's text and become more pronounced in the 'Eridu' version. The final upshot of the process is the grafting of the 'Akkadian' view of Beginnings upon the 'Sumerian' conception as we find it in the composite production, *Cuneiform Texts*, 13, pl. 35-38. In thus distinguishing between Sumerian and Akkadian views of Beginnings, many passages in the somewhat mixed conceptions held of Enki-Ea become clearer. It has always been puzzling to find him addressed by two names, conveying such contradictory points of view as 'a god of the land' and a god whose 'house,' i. e. his dwelling-place, is the 'water,'⁴⁸ and which leads to making him the *Lugal-zu-ab* or *Šar apsî*, 'king of the deep,' or the 'Lugal-Du-Azagga,' 'king of the holy habitation'—a synonym of the 'deep.' In long lists of the names and attributes of Ea, e. g., *Cuneiform Texts*, 24, pl. 14-15, we find designations that belong to a water-god such as *Lugal-id-da*, 'king of streams' (line 23), by the side of others like *Dug-gă-bur*, 'potter' (line 41 and 43), which point to a land deity. The frequent association of Enki-Ea

⁴⁸ Conveyed by the two signs *E* = 'house' and *a* 'water,' whether this be the correct etymology or merely a play on the name.

with the working of metals⁴⁹ likewise is more appropriate to a god whose home is in the mountains where metals are found, than to a god who dwells in the waters. The symbolism on Boundary Stones where Enki-Ea is represented as a ram's head, alternating or combined with a goat-fish,⁵⁰ may perhaps be explained in the same way as due to a combination of two different conceptions. However the combination of Enki with Ea is to be accounted for, so much at least is clear that Enki represents originally the Sumerian 'land' deity, who as the earliest god is naturally viewed as the creator of the universe. He becomes in this capacity the En-An-Ki, 'the lord of heaven and earth' (*Cuneiform Texts*, 24, pl. 14, 18), and the Nu-Dim-Mut, the general 'artificer' (line 19), whereas Ea is distinctively a conception that reflects conditions as they existed in the Euphrates Valley and must have originated in that region. We cannot go so far as to assert that the name is of 'Akkadian' origin (in which case the writing *E-a*, 'house of water,' would be an etymological 'play'), but we may say that the Sumerians did not know of Ea till they settled in the land of the 'Akkadians.' They added to the 'land' and mountain 'deity' the distinction of being also the lord of the Deep, and in that capacity called him Ea.

V

There is another aspect of the contrast between the Sumerian and Akkadian views of Beginnings that should be here considered, namely, the bearings of the thesis here brought forth on the remarkably similar contrast between the two accounts of creation in the Book of Genesis, the so-called P document, Gen. 1-2. 4^a and the J account Gen. 2. 4^b-25. The P document pictures the beginning of things as a time when the Tehôm, i. e. the watery element (Tiamat) covered everything—a time of lawlessness expressed by the famous phrase *Tohû Wa-Bohû*. The

⁴⁹ See Jastrow, *Religion Babyloniens und Assyriens*, 1. 176 and 293, where other designations of Ea in his capacity as the patron of the metal workers will be found, including Nin-Kur, lord of the mountains. In this capacity he is called Nin-igi-lamga-gid (*Cuneiform Texts*, 24, pl. 14, 38).

⁵⁰ See the list in Hinke, *A New Boundary Stone of Nebuchadrezzar I*, p. 241.

earth is submerged beneath the waters, and when these are gathered into one place the earth appears covered with verdure, whereupon vegetation follows. Then order is established in the universe by placing the sun and moon in control of the regulation of time and seasons—very much as in the Akkadian version,⁵¹ though with the modifications called for to adapt the old nature myth to an advanced monotheistic conception of creation and of Divine government. The world begins with the drying up of the waters and the cessation of storms and rain in the spring. In the J Document—the older of the two—the picture is just the reverse. The earth exists, but it is empty. There is no life in it—‘no one to till the ground,’ because no rain had fallen upon it. It is only after the earth is drenched⁵² that vegetation appears, preparing the earth to sustain human and animal life. The world, therefore, begins with the coming of the rainy season, i. e. in the fall, precisely as in the Sumerian view of Beginnings.⁵³ As between the two Biblical versions, the one in the J document fits in with climatic conditions in the interior of Palestine—a mountainous region with only one large river and with smaller streams and brooks that are very low or entirely empty in the dry season. The welfare of the population is dependent upon the fall and winter rains—the early and the late rains. Hence in the Jewish ritual, as developed in post-exilic days, the prayer is inserted at the time of the harvest festival that the early and late rains may fall in abundance.⁵⁴ The P version, on the other hand, reflects so unmistakably the conditions in Babylonia that there can be no doubt of its being an importation, superimposed through the sojourn of large bodies of Jews in that region after the fall of the Southern Hebrew monarchy. It follows that the traditional celebration of the

⁵¹ Tablet V.

⁵² The puzzling *ed* of Gen. 2. 6 conveys in some way the notion of a thorough drenching of the soil.

⁵³ It is only proper to add that Professor Sayce was the first to suggest an analogy between this Biblical version and the Sumerian point of view (*Expository Times*, November, 1915), though I had reached my conclusions independently before Sayce's article came into my hands. Note the curious resemblance in construction between Gen. 2. 5 ‘plant of the field had not yet sprouted, herb of the field had not yet grown’ and the opening lines of the ‘Eridu’ version (p. 286, above).

⁵⁴ Dembitz, *Jewish Services in Synagogue and Home*, p. 123 *seq.* and p. 130 *seq.*

Jewish New Year in the fall of the year, still maintained in the orthodox ritual of today, is older than the Jewish calendar which begins the official year with the first spring month. The calendar is due to direct borrowing from Babylonia, as is recognized in the Talmud.⁵⁵ Therefore, such a statement as that the month of the Exodus from Egypt is to be reckoned as the first of the months⁵⁶ even though the older name of the month is given,⁵⁷ along with the specific designation of the seventh month as the New Year's time,⁵⁸ is to be found in the P document and reflects the same influences that are betrayed in P's version of creation. To avoid the inconsistency of celebrating a 'New Year's day' at the beginning of the seventh month, P avoids the designation New Year (רֵאשׁ הַשָּׁנָה) and calls the festival זִכְרוֹן תְּרוּעָה 'Memorial of the Trumpet Sound,'⁵⁹ or יוֹם תְּרוּעָה, 'Day of the Trumpet Sound.' He clearly has a purpose in doing so,⁶⁰ but popular tradition, which is always stronger than official doctrine, maintained the designation רֵאשׁ הַשָּׁנָה for the established celebration of the New Year in the fall.⁶¹ Does it follow that, because the P version of creation betrays direct evidence of having been introduced into Genesis under influences emanating from Babylonia, the older J version is to be brought into direct connection with the Sumerian View of Beginnings? Hardly, for in view of the wide-spread tendency to evolve creation myths and tales among people everywhere after a certain stage of culture had been reached, when man's sense of curiosity is aroused as to how this world in which he lives, and how the larger universe above him came into being, it would be natural for the inhabitants of Palestine to produce a conception of Beginnings that would reflect climatic conditions prevailing in that country. The J version would, therefore, be the

⁵⁵ Talmud Yerushalmi, Rosh ha-Shana 1. 1.

⁵⁶ Exodus 12. 2.

⁵⁷ Ex. 13. 4; 23. 15; 34. 18; also Deut. 16. 1, which appears to be the source for the last two passages in Exodus.

⁵⁸ Lev. 23. 24.

⁵⁹ Num. 29. 1.

⁶⁰ Ezekiel 40. 1, however, uses the phrase—the only occurrence in the O. T., but even here the Greek text has 'first month.'

⁶¹ See further on this point Paul Volz, *Das Neujahrsfest Jahwes*, p. 10 seq.

indigenous one;⁶² the P, the borrowed one. The analogies presented by the former with the Sumerian view would be due to similar climatic conditions in the districts in which they arose. The theory of direct borrowing in the case of the J version is also excluded by the predominance of the Akkadian version in Babylonian literature, leading as we have seen to attempts to adapt the old Sumerian myths to the Akkadian point of view and of which some illustrations have been given.

Traces of the Sumerian view, however, survived in Babylonian Literature,⁶³ and if the above endeavor to differentiate between

⁶² According to the fragment of the old Canaanitish 'agricultural' calendar found in Gezer (*Quarterly Statement of the Palestine Exploration Fund*, 1909, p. 31) the year began in the fall. The old Persian year likewise began in the fall but was afterwards—so in the Avesta—transferred to the spring, no doubt again under Babylonian influence. See Jackson, 'Iranische Religion,' in *Grundriss der Iranischen Philologie*, 2. 677. Similarly, the ancient Arabs, who under foreign influences transferred the older New Year's period from the fall to the spring (Wellhausen, *Reste Arabischen Heidentums*, p. 99).

⁶³ There are, in fact, some indications that the seventh month was at one time regarded in Babylonia like Nisan as 'the beginning of the year.' See Jastrow, *Religion Babyloniens und Assyriens* 2. 462, in the discussion of an explanatory comment to an official report of the appearance of the new moon. The Babylonians may have had, like the Jews, two 'calendars,' an official one beginning in the spring and a 'religious' one beginning in the fall. If so, the latter would be a trace of the older Sumerian view which, as we have seen, would have led to beginning the year in the fall. The name for the seventh month *tašritu* which has the force of 'beginning' (see Muss-Arnolt, *Assyrian Dictionary*, p. 1201^b) likewise points in this direction. The Sumerian designation of this month Du-Azagga = 'holy habitation' is a direct reference to the place where Enki and his consort at the beginning of things dwell; and it is interesting to note as a further trace of the Sumerian view localizing this holy place in a 'mountain,' (and not in the Euphrates Valley), that in a bilingual hymn (Rawlinson V., pl. 50, 5^a) Du-Azagga is equated with *šadû*, 'mountain,' further described as Ki Nam-tar-tar-ri-e-ne = *ašar simâtum*, 'place of fates.' The name Du-Azagga thus appears to be a direct allusion to a 'Sumerian' myth, such as we have in the two Sumerian versions of Beginnings above analyzed. The designation of Nabu as the god of the Du-Azagga, 'holy habitation,' (Brünnow, no. 9609) is of course a late transfer of the attributes of Enki-Ea at a time when Enki had become a 'water-god,' and the Du-Azagga had been identified with the *apsû* or 'deep.'

The assumption of 'two' calendars is nothing unusual. The Rabbis, in fact, recognize 'four' New Year periods: (1) 1st of Nisan as 'civil,' for dating reigns of rulers and for festivals; (2) 1st of Tishri for reckon-

the Sumerian and Akkadian views of Beginnings is correct, we would have also a valuable criterion for distinguishing, in the conceptions connected with Enki-Ea, as in the case of other distinctly Sumerian deities like Enlil, and in the transfer of the attributes of such gods as Enki and Enlil to the later head of the Babylonian pantheon Marduk, between traits that reflect the original nature of these deities, and such as are due to the natural process in transferring conceptions of gods belonging to a mountainous people with the climatic and economic conditions appertaining thereto, to become the protective Powers of an agricultural population, dwelling in a region in which water was plentiful.

ing time and as the agricultural New Year; (3) 1st of Elul (sixth month) for tithing cattle; and (4) 1st (or 15th) of Shebat (eleventh month), the New Year for trees (Talmud Babli, Rosh ha-Shana, 1 a).

Finally, the order of the months in the older Babylonian calendar, in force during the Sargon period and in the Ur dynasty, points to a year beginning in August-September. See Kugler, *Sternkunde und Sterndienst in Babel*, 2. 174 seq. This would reflect the Sumerian point of view, whereas the change during the Hammurapi period to a calendar beginning the year with the first spring month would be due to the assertion of Akkadian influence. It may be that as a consequence of the mixture of two different points of view 'two' calendars continued to be recognized, at least for a time, the older one surviving in the cult and the later one becoming the official calendar for dated documents and the like. The relationship between the older and later Babylonian calendars is, however, a subject that requires further investigation.